

11-3-64

**SLAVERY AND THE REBELLION,
ONE AND INSEPARABLE.**

S P E E C H

OF

HON. CHARLES SUMNER,

BEFORE THE

New York Young Men's Republican Union,

AT

COOPER INSTITUTE, NEW YORK,

ON THE AFTERNOON OF NOVEMBER 5, 1864.

BOSTON:

WRIGHT & POTTER, PRINTERS, No. 4 SPRING LANE.

1864.



PREFATORY NOTE.

The following speech was delivered by SENATOR SUMNER at Cooper Institute, New York, on the afternoon of Saturday, November 5th, 1864, before one of the largest audiences ever assembled within the walls of that capacious hall. By this publication, the YOUNG MEN'S REPUBLICAN UNION, at whose invitation the speech was delivered, brings to a close the arduous labors of its third presidential campaign; the last of a series of political battles, begun, prosecuted and completed, in the interest and for the furtherance of the principles, so nobly and eloquently reasserted in the Massachusetts senator's last and greatest speech.

Among the auditors, on this occasion, were at least two hundred clergymen, of all denominations, from New York, Brooklyn, Newark and other adjacent cities. Not less than one thousand ladies, and an equal number of the most eminent citizens of New York, also aided to swell the crowd that assembled to do honor to the distinguished orator and to express the sympathy and interest they felt in the great cause, in whose behalf he was announced to plead.

Besides FRANCIS LIEBER, LL. D., the widely known professor of political science in Columbia College, who was chosen Chairman of the meeting by acclamation, there were upon the platform many of the men and women of New York, whose names and deeds, in various walks of life, have illustrated the annals of Freedom's trials and triumphs in America.

Dr. LIEBER, upon taking the chair, made a brief and appropriate address, at the close of which he introduced Hon. EDWIN D. MORGAN, who read a telegram, received from San Francisco, giving assurance of a Union victory in California; the reading of this dispatch was hailed with applause and cheers. When order had been restored the Chairman presented the orator of the occasion, who was made the recipient of an ovation, such as has seldom been accorded to a speaker in New York.

The speech, throughout, was received with every evidence of enthusiasm and approval on the part of the vast audience; the applause frequently interrupting the speaker for several moments and, at times, causing the hall to become the scene of the wildest excitement. Few of those who were successful in securing admission, on this occasion, will forget the rounds of applause, the hearty cheers, the clapping of fair hands and the waving of hundreds of snowy handkerchiefs, by which the swarming crowd so often testified its appreciation of Mr. Sumner's scholarly diction, effective eloquence and patriotic, statesmanlike utterance of these great political truths. It is but simple truth to say, that none of the many political meetings of the campaign, in New York, could at all compare with this mass meeting of the flower of our citizenship, whether regard be had to the numbers, intelligence, social position, or sound sentiments of loyalty, which were the characteristics of the great gathering of November 5th, 1864.

NEW YORK YOUNG MEN'S REPUBLICAN UNION.

OFFICERS.

MARK HOYT, *President.*
DEXTER A. HAWKINS, *Vice-President.*
FRANK W. BALLARD, *Corresponding Secretary.*
CHARLES T. RODGERS, *Treasurer.*

BOARD OF CONTROL.

CEPHAS BRAINERD, <i>Chairman.</i>	BENJAMIN F. MANIERRE.
MARK HOYT.	THOMAS L. THORNELL.
DEXTER A. HAWKINS.	WILLIAM M. FRANKLIN.
FRANK W. BALLARD.	CHARLES C. NOTT.
CHARLES T. RODGERS.	JAMES H. WELSH.
GEORGE H. MATHEWS.	

S P E E C H .

FELLOW-CITIZENS :—

In all the concerns of life, the first necessity is to see and comprehend the circumstances about us. Without this knowledge human conduct must fail. Without this knowledge the machine cannot be worked; the ground cannot be tilled; the ship cannot be navigated; war cannot be waged; government cannot be conducted. The old Greek, suddenly enveloped in a cloud while battling with his enemies, exclaimed, "Give me to see;" but this exclamation of the warrior is the exclamation, also, of every person in practical life, whether striving for his country or only for himself. "Give me to see," that I may comprehend my duty. "Give me to see," that I may recognize my enemy. "Give me to see," that I may know where to strike.

Diagnosis Essential.

The good physician, before any prescription for his patient, endeavors, by a careful diagnosis, to ascertain the nature of the disease or injury, and when this is done, he proceeds with confidence. Without such knowledge all medical skill must fail. You do not forget how it failed in the recent case of the Italian patriot, Garibaldi, suffering cruelly from a wound in the foot—received at the unfortunate battle of Aspramonte—which, for a long time, nobody seemed to understand. Eminent surgeons of different countries were at fault. At last, Nélaton, the liberal professor of the Medical School at Paris, left his pupils and patients and journeyed into Italy to visit the illustrious sufferer. Other surgeons had said that there was no ball lodged in the foot; the French surgeon, after a careful diagnosis, declared that there was, and at once extracted it. From that time Garibaldi has gained in health and strength, thanks to his scientific visitor, who was enabled to understand his case.

Not Party now but Country.

But nowhere is the diagnosis more important than in national affairs. Men are naturally patriotic. They love their country with instinctive love, quickened at the mother's knee, and nursed in the earliest teachings of the school. For country they

offer fortune and life. But while thus devoted, they do not always see clearly the line of duty. Local prejudice, personal antipathy and selfish interest obscure the vision. And far beyond all these is the disturbing influence of "party," which acts with all the power of discipline and organization added to numbers. Men attach themselves to a political party as to a religion, and yield blindly to its behests. By an error of judgment, rather than of the heart, they give up to party what was meant for country or mankind. I do not condemn political parties, but simply warn against their tyranny. A patriotic Opposition, watchful of the public service, is hardly less important than a patriotic Administration. They are the complements of each other, and even while in open conflict, unite in duty to their country. But a political party which ceases to be patriotic, which openly takes sides with Rebellion, which sends up "blue lights" as a signal to an armed foe, or which subtly undermines those popular energies that are now needed for the national defence that our country may live—such a party is an engine of frightful evil, to be abhorred "as the gates of hell." It is, unhappily, one of the evils of party always, even in its best estate, that it tends to dominate over its members, so as to create an oligarchical power, a sort of *imperium in imperio*, which may overshadow the government itself. But this influence becomes disastrous beyond measure when bad men obtain control or bad ideas prevail. Then must all who are not ready to forget their country consider carefully the consequences of their conduct. Adherence to party may be next door to treason.

Fellow-citizens, I address you as patriots who love their country and would not willingly see it suffer; who rejoice in its triumphs and long to behold its flag furled in peace. But it is the nature of a true patriotism to love country most when it is most in peril. As dangers thicken and the skies darken, the patriot soul is roused by internal fire so that no sacrifice seems too great. And now, when the national life is assailed by traitors at home, while foreign powers look on with wicked sympathy, I begin by asking that you should forget "party" and all its watchwords. Think only of country.

Object of the War.

There is much misconception, even among well-meaning persons, with regard to the object of the war, while partisans do not tire of misrepresenting it. A plain statement will show the truth as it is.

It is often said that the object of the war on our part is simply to restore the Constitution, and much mystification is employed with regard to the essential limits of such a contest. Mr. Crittenden's resolution, adopted by both Houses of Congress, declared that the war was "not waged on our part in any spirit of oppression, nor for any purpose of conquest or subjugation, *nor purpose*

of overthrowing or interfering with the rights or established institutions of States; but to defend and maintain the supremacy of the Constitution and to preserve the Union with all the dignity, equality and rights of the several States unimpaired." I rejoice to remember that I did not vote for that resolution. It was unsatisfactory to me at the time and is more unsatisfactory now. While plausible in form, it was in the nature of a snare.

Again it is said that the object of the war is to abolish Slavery. This also is a mistake, although it is generally urged by those who seek occasion to criticise the war, and, therefore, it is in the nature of a misrepresentation. At the beginning of the war and during its early stages, Slavery was left untouched in the enjoyment of a peculiar immunity, such as was accorded to no other rebel interest. If this peculiar immunity has been discontinued, it is only because Slavery is at last seen in its true character, and because its absolute identity with the Rebellion has come to be recognized.

Not to restore the Constitution, not to abolish Slavery, do we now go forth to battle. For neither of these. But simply *to put down the Rebellion*. It is this and nothing more. Never in history was there a war where the object was so manifest. If, in the process of putting down the Rebellion, the Constitution shall be completely restored or Slavery shall be completely abolished, the war will still be the same in its essential object.

Origin of the War.

Look at its origin and you will see how its true character appears beyond question. Certain slave-masters, after long years of conspiracy, rose against the Republic and struck at its life. The reason assigned for this parricide was as strange as the deed. It was simply because the people of the United States, by a constitutional majority, according to the forms of law, had elected Abraham Lincoln as President. On this alleged reason, and to defeat his administration, Rebellion was organized. You are familiar with the succession of parricidal blows that ensued. State after State, beginning with South Carolina, always traitorous, undertook to withdraw from the Union. Their Senators and Representatives in Congress actually withdrew from the National Capitol, leaving behind menaces of war. Custom-houses, post-offices, mints, arsenals, forts, — all possessions of the National Government, — one after the other were seized by the rebel slave-masters. As early as 1st of January, 1861, while James Buchanan was President, the palmetto flag was hoisted over the custom-house and post-office at Charleston. It had already been hoisted over Castle Pinckney and Fort Moultrie in the harbor of Charleston, while the national force left in these fortresses surrendered to the rebel slave-masters. This was followed by the seizure of Fort

Pulaski at Savannah, Fort Morgan at Mobile, Fort Jackson and Fort St. Philip at New Orleans, Fort Barrancas and Fort McRae, with the navy-yard at Pensacola. Throughout that whole rebel region two fortresses only remained to the National Government. These were Fort Sumter and Fort Pickens. Already the steamer *Star* of the West, bearing re-enforcements to the small garrison cooped up in Fort Sumter, had been fired at in the harbor of Charleston, and compelled to put back discomfited to New York. All this was war. Meanwhile the rebel States had taken the form of a confederacy, with Slavery as its corner-stone, and had proceeded to organize an immense military force in the service of the Rebellion. At last, after long continued preparations, the rebel batteries opened upon Fort Sumter, which, after a defence of thirty-four hours, was compelled to surrender. There was rejoicing at the rebel capital, and the rebel Secretary of War, addressing an immense audience, let drop words which reveal the true character of the war. "No man," said he, "could tell where the war this day commenced would end, but he would prophecy that the flag which now flaunts the breeze here would float over the old Capitol at Washington before the first of May. Let them try *Southern chivalry* and test the extent of Southern resources, and it might float eventually over Faneuil Hall itself." It was already the 12th April, and the rebel flag was to float over the National Capitol before the 1st of May. Surely it was time that something should be done in self-defence.

Thus far the National Government had done nothing — absolutely nothing. It had received blow after blow; it had seen its possessions, one after another, wrested from its power; it had seen State after State assume the front of Rebellion; it had seen the whole combined in a pseudo-confederacy, with a rebel President, surrounded by a rebel Cabinet and a rebel Congress; and it had bent under a storm of shot and shell from rebel batteries. At last it spoke, calling the country to arms. Search history, and you can find no instance of equal audacity on the part of rebels, and no instance of equal forbearance on the part of government.

War of Self-Defence.

The country was called to arms. Nobody can forget that day when the people everywhere, inspired by patriotic ardor, rose in *necessary self-defence* to save the national Capitol and Faneuil Hall already menaced. The war for the Rebellion had begun long before; but it began for the country at that great uprising, when all seemed filled with one generous purpose and nobody hesitated. Men calling themselves Democrats vied with Republicans. Daniel S. Dickinson and Benjamin F. Butler made haste to join their country. Party differences were all forgotten as the tocsin sounded.

It was the tocsin summoning the country to defend itself. The war then and there recognized, was, on our part, a war of national defence, and its simple object was to put down the Rebellion. You confuse yourself if you say, that it was to restore the Constitution, and you misrepresent the fact if you say that it was to abolish Slavery. It was for the suppression of the Rebellion; nor more, nor less.

The Rebellion and Slavery one and the same.

Here, then, fellow-citizens, it becomes important to know and comprehend the Rebellion, and especially its animating impulse, or soul. Its diagnosis has, from the beginning, been essential to the right conduct of the war; and if, at any time, the war has seemed to fail, or foreign powers have seemed to lower, it is because our government has not recognized the true character of the Rebellion. "Give me to see," is the exclamation of every patriot, that our blows may not fail. It was obvious, at once, to all familiar with history, that this Rebellion stood out in bad eminence, unlike any other of which we have authentic record on earth; that it was not a dynastic struggle, as in the adventurous expeditions of the British Pretender; that it was not a religious struggle, as in the French wars of the League; that it was not a struggle against a conqueror, as in the repeated outbreaks of Ireland; that it was not a struggle for freedom, like that of Switzerland against Austria, of Holland against Spain, of our fathers against England, of the Spanish American States against Spain, and of Greece against Turkey; but that it had in it none of these elements, whether dynasty, religion or freedom, for it was simply a struggle for Slavery; and so completely had Slavery entered into and possessed it, that the Rebellion was changed to itself. If you would find a parallel to this transcendent wickedness, you must pass "the flaming bounds of space and time" and look on that earliest Rebellion, when Satan strove against the Almighty Throne, to establish the supremacy of Sin, even as now this insensate Rebellion strives to establish the supremacy of Slavery. It is because partisans have failed to see the true character of the Rebellion, or been unwilling to recognize it, that they have not felt how absurd it was to say that the war on our part has been changed, when nothing has been done but to recognize the identity between Slavery and the Rebellion. There has been no change. It is still a war to put down the Rebellion; but we are in earnest, and are determined that the Rebellion shall not save itself by skulking under the *alias* of Slavery. Call it Rebellion or call it Slavery, it is one and the same.

Two elemental forces, Slavery and Liberty, face to face.

A glance, only, at the immediate origin of this war is enough for the present occasion. But, in order to dispel all darkness and to determine our duty, let me take you for a few moments back to the distant origin of the two elemental forces, which are now in deadly conflict.

Looking at the question abstractly these two elemental forces are nothing but Slavery and Liberty. It is almost superfluous to add that these are natural enemies, and cannot exist together. Where Slavery is there Liberty cannot be; and where Liberty is there Slavery cannot be. To uphold Slavery, there must be an uncompromising denial of Liberty; to uphold Liberty there must be an uncompromising denial of Slavery. Each in self-defence must stifle the other. Therefore between the two there is constant hostility and undying hate. This eternal warfare is not peculiar to our country. It belongs to the nature of universal man. If it fails to show itself anywhere, it is because Slavery has won its most detestable triumph, and blotted out the Heaven-born sentiment of freedom. Circumstances among us, going back to our earliest history, have given unprecedented activity to these two incompatible principles, and have at last brought them into bloody battle, face to face. But it is only a part of the universal conflict which must endure so long as a single slave shall wear a chain. Slavery itself is *a state of war*, ready to burst forth in blood whenever the slave reclaims that liberty which is his right, or whenever mankind refuses to sanction its inhuman pretensions.

The Slave-Ship, and the May-Flower in 1620.

Go back to the earliest days of colonial history, and you will find the conflict already preparing. It was in 1620, that nineteen slaves were landed at Jamestown in Virginia — the first that ever pressed the soil of our country. In that same year the Pilgrims landed at Plymouth. Those two cargoes contained the hostile germs, which have ripened in our time. They fitly symbolize our gigantic strife. On the one side is the slave-ship, and on the other is the May-Flower. Early events derive importance as we learn to recognize their undoubted consequences, and these two ships may be regarded hereafter with additional interest when it is seen that in them were the beginnings of the present war.

Perhaps in all the romantic legends of the sea, there is nothing more striking than the contrast presented by these two vessels. Each had ventured forth upon an untried and perilous ocean to find an unknown and distant coast. In this they were alike; but in all else how unlike! One was freighted with human beings forcibly torn from their own country, and hurried away in chains to be sold as slaves. The other was filled with good men, who had vol-

untarily turned their backs upon their own country, to seek other homes, where at least they might be free. One was heavy with curses and with sorrow. The other was lifted with anthem and with prayer. And thus, at the same time, beneath the same sun, over the same waves, they found their way. It requires no effort of imagination to see on board one of those ships Slavery, and on board of the other Liberty, traversing the ocean to continue here on this broad continent their immitigable war.

There is no record of what passed in the cabin of the slave-ship, before the landing of the slaves. The wail of Slavery, the clank of chains, and the voice of the master counting the price of his cargo, there must have been. But the cabin of the *May-Flower* witnessed another scene, of which there is an authentic record, as the whole company, by solemn compact, deliberately constituted themselves a body politic, and set the grand example of a Christian Commonwealth, thus indicating the character which had been claimed for them, as "knit together in a strict and sacred bond by virtue of which they held themselves bound to take care of the good of each other and of the whole." And so these two voyages closed.

Influence of the two Ships.

Look at the early social life of the two warring sections, and you will see the influence of these two ships. Virginia continued to be supplied with slaves, so that Slavery became a part of herself. On the other hand, New England always set her face against Slavery. To her great honor, in an age when Slavery was less condemned than now, the legislature of Massachusetts censured a ship-master who had "fraudulently and injuriously brought a negro from Guinea," and, by solemn vote, resolved that the negro should be "sent back without delay;" and not long after enacted the law of Exodus, "If any man stealeth a man, he shall surely be put to death." Thus at that early day stood Virginia and New England; for such at that time was the designation of the two provinces which divided British America by a line of demarkation very nearly coincident with the recent slave line of our Republic.

Opposite Character of the Settlers of Virginia and New England.

But the contrast between the two colonies, as illustrated by these two voyages, appears equally in the opposite character of their respective settlers. Like seeks like, and the Pilgrims of the *May-Flower* were followed by others of similar virtues,—whose first labors on landing were to build churches and schools. Many of them had the best education of England; some were men of substance, and there was no poverty among them that could cause a blush, while all were most exact and exemplary in conduct. They were a branch from that grand Puritan stock, to which,

according to the reluctant confession of Hume, "the English were indebted for the whole freedom of their Constitution." We are told by Burke that there is a sacred veil to be drawn over the beginnings of all governments, and that where this is not happily supplied by time, it must be found in a discreet silence. But no veil is needed for the Puritan settlers of New England. It is very different with the early settlers of Virginia, recruited from the castaways and shirks of Old England, and mostly needy men, of desperate fortunes and dissolute lives, who cared nothing for churches or schools. Such people naturally became slave-masters. I should not lift the veil which charity would kindly draw over those early settlers, if a just knowledge of their character had not become important in illustrating the origin of our troubles.

Absurd pretence that Virginia was settled by Cavaliers.

It is a common boast of our slave-masters that they constitute a modern "chivalry," derived from the "cavaliers" of England and reinforced by the ennobling influences of African Slavery. This boast has been so often repeated, that it has obtained a certain acceptance among those not familiar with our early history, and even well-informed persons have allowed themselves to say that the conflict in which we are now engaged is a continuance of the old war between the Cavaliers and the Roundheads. So far as it is intended to say that the war is a part of the ever-recurring conflict between Slavery and Liberty, there can be no objection to this illustration. But if it be intended to say that the rebels are "cavaliers," or the descendants of cavaliers, there is just ground of objection. I know not if the armies of the Union, now fighting the world's greatest battle for Human Rights, may not be called Roundheads; but I am sure that the rebels, now fighting for Slavery, cannot be called "cavaliers" in any sense. They are not so in character, as their barbarism attests. And they are as little so historically.

The whole pretension is a preposterous absurdity by which the country has been already too much deceived. It is not creditable to the general intelligence that such a folly should be allowed to play such a part. Unquestionably there were settlers in Virginia, as there were also in New England, connected with aristocratic families. But they were so few in each colony as not to modify essentially the prevailing population, which took its character from the mass rather than from any individual. The origin of Virginia is so well authenticated as to leave little doubt with regard to the character of its population, unless you reject all the concurrent testimony of contemporaries and all the concurrent admissions of historians. Perhaps there is nothing in our early history with regard to which the authorities are so various and so clear. From their very abundance, it is difficult to choose.

True character of Settlers of Virginia.

I begin with the early patron of Virginia, Lord Delaware, who after visiting the colony described the people there in a letter dated at Jamestown, July 7, 1610, as "men of distempered bodies and infected minds, whom no examples daily before their eyes, either of goodness or punishment, can deter from their habitual impieties or terrify from a shameful death." [*Strachey's History. Preface, p. 32.*] Language cannot be stronger.

But the colony, which began with bad men, was increased by worse. In 1619, king James wrote to the Virginia Company, commanding them "to send a hundred dissolute persons to Virginia, whom the knight marshal shall deliver." [*Strachey's History of Virginia. Vol. 1, p. 168.*] Thus by royal command was this colony made a Botany Bay.

The company, not content with the "hundred dissolute persons" supplied by the king's order, entreated for more, until Captain John Smith, the hero of Virginia, was moved to express his disgust. He testifies to the evil when he wrote in 1622: "Since I came from thence, the honorable company have been humble suitors to his majesty to get vagabond and condemned men to go thither; nay, so much scorned was the name of Virginia, some did choose to be hanged ere they would go thither, and were." [*Smith's New England Trials, 1622.*] This was bad enough.

But the Virginia Company seem to have been insensible to the shame of such a settlement. Its agents and orators vindicated the utility of the colony on this account. In a work entitled "*Nova Britannia*," offering most excellent fruits by planting in Virginia," published in London in 1609 and dedicated to "one of his majesty's council for Virginia," it was openly argued, that unless "swarms of idle persons in lewd and naughty practices" were sent abroad "we must provide shortly *more prisons and corrections* for their bad conditions;" and that it was "most profitable for our state to rid our multitudes of such as lie at home, pestering the land with pestilence and penury and infecting one another with vice and villany, worse than the plague itself." Dr. Donne, dean of St. Paul's, poet also, in a sermon "preached to the Honorable Company of the Virginian Plantation 13th November, 1622," thus sets forth the merits of the colony: "The plantation shall redeem many a wretch from the laws of death; from the hands of the executioner. It shall sweep your streets and wash your doors from idle persons, and the children of idle persons, and employ them." Such were the puffs by which recruits were gained for Virginia.

History records the unquestionable result, and here the authorities multiply. Sir Jonathan Child, in his "Discourse of the Trade of the Plantations," published in 1698 says: "*Virginia*

and Barbadoes were *first peopled* by a sort of loose vagrant people. Had it not been for our plantations, they must have come to be *hanged or starved*, or sold for soldiers." Dr. Douglass, in his Colonial History, printed in 1749, gives the following testimony: "Our plantations in America, *New England excepted*, have been generally settled: 1. By malcontents from the administrations from time to time. 2. By fraudulent debtors as a refuge from creditors; and 3, by convicts or criminals who chose transportation rather than death." [*Douglass' History*, Vol. 2, p. 428.] Graham, the Scotch historian, who has written so conscientiously of our country, speaking of the first settlers, says of Virginia: "A great proportion of these new emigrants, consisted of profligate and licentious youths, sent from England by their friends, with the hope of changing their destinies, or for the purpose of screening them from the justice or contempt of their country; * * * with others like these, more likely to corrupt and prey upon an infant commonwealth than to foster it." [*Graham, United States*, Vol. 1, p. 54.] The historian of Virginia, William Stith, whose work was published at Williamsburg in the last century, is not less explicit: "I cannot but remark," he says, "how early that custom arose of transporting loose and dissolute persons to Virginia, as a place of punishment and disgrace, which although originally designed for the advancement and increase of the colony, yet has certainly proved a great prejudice and hindrance to its growth; for it hath laid one of the finest countries of British America under the unjust scandal of being *a mere hell upon earth*, another Siberia, and only fit for the reception of malefactors and the vilest of the people; so that few, at least few large bodies of people have been induced willingly to transport themselves to such a place, and our younger sisters the northern colonies, have profited thereby." [*Stith's History of Virginia*, Vol. 1, p. 168.] But this is not all. Another historian of Virginia of our own day, whose work was published at Richmond, in 1846, while showing that pride in his State which would change every settler into a "cavalier," has been compelled to make the following most rueful confession: "Gentlemen reduced to poverty by gaming and extravagance, too proud to beg, too lazy to dig—broken tradesmen with some stigma of fraud yet clinging to their names—footmen, who had expended in the mother country the last shred of honest reputation that was ever held—rakes consumed with disease and shattered in the service of impurity—libertines whose race of sin was yet to run—and unruly sparks packed off by their friends to escape worse destinies at home—these were the men who came to aid in founding a nation and to transmit to posterity their own immaculate impress." [*Howison, History of Virginia*, Vol. 1, p. 169.] And this same historian confesses that social life in Virginia, being—

ning in such baseness, after more than a century, had developed "an aristocracy neither of talent, nor learning, nor moral worth, but of land and slave interest." [*Ibid*, Vol. 2, p. 201.] So much for the testimony of history, even when written and printed in Virginia.

I know not the number of desperate persons shipped to Virginia; but there were enough to leave an indelible impression on the colony, and to give it a name in the literature of the time. It was this colony which suggested to Bacon the most pregnant words of one of his Essays; which furnished to DeFoe several striking passages in one of his romances; and which provoked Massinger to a dialogue in one of his dramas. Let me glance for one moment at these illustrations.

It is in the Essay on "Plantations," that Bacon thus brands the early settlement of Virginia: "It is a shameful and unblessed thing to take *the scum of people and wicked condemned men* to be the people with whom you plant; and not only so but it *spoileth the plantation*, for they will ever live like rogues." [*Bacon's Essays*, 33.] Surely there is nothing here out of which to construct a "cavalier."

In the narrative of Moll Flanders, the author of Robinson Crusoe, who gives to all his sketches such lifelike character that they seem to be sun-pictures, exhibits this same colony. Here is a glimpse: "The greater part of the inhabitants were of two sorts, 1st, such as were brought over by the masters of the ships to be sold as servants; 2d, such as were transported, after having been found guilty of crimes punishable with death. When they come here we make no difference; the planters buy them, and they work together in the field till their time is out. * * * Hence many a Newgate-bird becomes a great man. We have several justices of the peace, officers of the trained bands and magistrates of the town they live in, that have been burnt in the hand. * * Some of the best men in the country are burnt in the hand, and are not ashamed to own it. There's Major ——, he was an eminent pickpocket; there's Justice Ba——r, he was a shoplifter. Both of them were burned in the hand, and I could name you several such as they are." [*Fortunes and Misfortunes of the Famous Moll Flanders*, p. 88.] Nothing is said here of "cavaliers."

I have referred to Massinger. Here is a curious bit from one of the grave comedies of that poet dramatist.

"*Luke*. It is but to Virginia.

Lady Frugal. How! Virginia!

High Heaven forbid! Remember, sir, I beseech you,

What creatures are shipped thither.

Anne. Condemned wretches,

Forfeited to the law;

For the abomination of their life,

Spewed out of their own country."

The City Madam. Act V, sc. 1.

Thus from every quarter the testimony accumulates. And yet we are constantly told that Virginia was settled by "cavaliers."

Early Settlers of South Carolina.

The territory now occupied by South Carolina originally constituted a part of Virginia. It was out of Virginia that it was carved into a separate colony. Although differing in some respects, the populations seem to have been kindred in character. Ramsay, the historian of the State, in a work published at Charleston, in 1809, says that, "the emigrants were a medley of different nations and principles," and that among them were persons "who took refuge from the powers of fortune and the rigor of creditors;" "young men, reduced to misery by folly and excess;" and "restless spirits, fond of roving." To these were added Huguenots, driven from France by the revocation of the edict of Nantes. [*Ramsay's History of South Carolina*, p. 2, 3, 5.] But Graham tells us that, "not a trace of the existence of an order of clergymen is to be found in the laws of Carolina during the first twenty years of its history." [*History of United States*. Vol. 2, p. 83.] And another historian says that, "the inhabitants, far from living in friendship and harmony among themselves, were seditious and ungovernable." [*Hewitt's History of South Carolina*. Vol. 1, p. 104.] Such a people were naturally insensible to moral distinctions, so that, according to Hewitt, "pirates were treated with great civility and friendship," and, "by bribery and corruption, they often found favor with the provincial juries, and by this means escaped the hands of justice." All of which is declared by the historian to be "evidences of the licentious spirit which prevailed in the colony." [*Ibid*, pp. 92, 115.] Graham uses still stronger language, when he says, "the governor, the proprietors, deputies and the principal inhabitants, degraded themselves to a level with the vilest of mankind, by abetting the crimes of pirates and becoming receivers of their nefarious acquisitions." [*History of United States*. Vol. 2, p. 121.] Such is the testimony with regard to South Carolina. To call such a people "cavaliers," is an abuse of terms.

The "Cavalier" pretension dismissed to contempt.

I hope that I have not taken too much time in exposing a vain-glorious pretension, which has helped to give the Rebellion a character of respectability it does not deserve. I dismiss it to general contempt, as one of the lies by which Slavery, the greatest lie of all, has been recommended to weak persons who could be deceived by names. But you will not fail to remark how naturally Slavery flourished among such a congenial people. Convicts and wretches who had set at naught all rights of property and all decency, were the very people to set up the revolting pretension of "property in man."

Conflict between Slavery and Liberty.

I come back to the postulate with which I began, that the present war is simply a conflict between Slavery and Liberty. This is a plain statement, which will defy contradiction. To my mind it is more satisfactory than that other statement, which is often made, that it is a conflict between Aristocracy and Democracy. This in a certain sense is true; but from its generality it is less effective than a more precise and restricted statement. It does not disclose the whole truth; for it does not exhibit the unique and exceptional character of the pretension which we combat. For centuries there has been a conflict between Aristocracy and Democracy, or, in other words, the few on one side have been perpetually striving to rule and oppress the many. But now for the first time in the world's annals a people professing civilization has commenced war to uphold the intolerable pretension *to compel labor without wages*, and that most disgusting incident, the whipping of women and the selling of children. Call these pretenders aristocrats or oligarchs if you will; but do not forget that their aristocracy or oligarchy is the least respectable of any ever attempted, and is so entirely modern that it is antedated by the Durham bull Hubbuck, the short-horn progenitor of the oligarchy of cattle, and by the stallion Godolphin, the Arabian progenitor of the oligarchy of horses, both of which may be traced to the middle of the last century. And do not forget that, if you would find a prototype in brutality, you must turn your back upon civilized history, and repair to those distant islands which witnessed an oligarchy of cannibals, or go to barbarous Africa, which has been kept in barbarism by an oligarchy of men-stealers.

Liberty throughout the World.

Thus it stands. The conflict is directly between Slavery and Liberty. But because Slavery aims at the life of the Republic, the conflict involves our national existence; and because our national death would be the despair of Liberty everywhere, it involves this great cause throughout the world. And yet I would not for one moment lose sight of the special enemy; for our energies can be properly directed only when we are able to confront him. "Give me to see," said the old Greek; and this must be our exclamation now.

Slavery a Disturber always.

Slavery, from the beginning, has been a disturber, and it is now a red-handed traitor. I do not travel back before the Revolution; but starting from that great event, I show you Slavery always offensive, and forever thrusting itself in the path of national peace and honor. The Declaration of Independence, as originally prepared by Jefferson, contained a vigorous passage denounc-

ing king George for his patronage of the slave-trade. The slave-masters insisted upon striking it out, and it was struck out; and here was their first victory. At the adoption of the Federal Constitution they insisted upon the recognition of the slave-trade as the condition of Union; and here was another victory. In the earliest Congress, under the Constitution, they commenced the menace of disunion, and this menace was continued at every turn of public affairs, especially at every proposition or even petition touching Slavery, until it triumphed signally in that atrocious Fugitive Slave Bill, which made all the Free States a hunting ground for slaves. Throughout these contests Slavery was vulgar, brutal, savage, while its braggart orators and chaplains heralded its claims. Hogarth, in his famous picture of Bruin, painted Slavery when he portrayed an immense grizzly bear hugging, as if he loved it, an enormous gnarled bludgeon, with a brand of infamy labelled on every knot, such as *Lie Twelve*, *Lie Fifteen*, and about his throat a clerical band, torn, crumpled and awry. In the States where it flourished, speech and press were both despoiled of their freedom, and the whole country seemed to be fast sinking under its degrading tyranny. Everything in science, or history, or church, or state, was bent to its support. There was a new political economy, which taught the superiority of slave labor; a new ethnology, which excluded the slave from the family of man; a new heraldry, which admitted the slave-master to the list of nobles; a new morality, which vindicated the rightfulness of Slavery; a new religion, which recognised Slavery as a missionary enterprise; a new theodicy, which placed Slavery under the sanctions of divine benevolence; and a new Constitution, which installed Slavery in the very citadel of our liberties. By such strange inventions the giant felony fortified itself. At last it struck at the pioneers of Liberty in Kansas. There was its first battle. The next was when it took up arms against the National Government and rallied all its forces in bloody rebellion. Thus is this Rebellion, by unquestionable pedigree, derived from Slavery, and the parent lives in the offspring.

Rebellion is Belligerent Slavery.

Therefore, if you are in earnest against the Rebellion, you must be in earnest, also, against Slavery; for the two are synonymous or convertible terms. The Rebellion is nothing but Slavery in arms. It is belligerent Slavery.

To save the Country, we must strike at Slavery.

It is, when we see the Rebellion *as it is*, in its true light, face to face, that we see our whole duty. Then must the patriot, whatever may have been his personal prejudices or party associations, insist, at all hazards, that Slavery shall not be suffered to escape

from that righteous judgment which is the doom of the Rebellion. No false tenderness, no casuistry of politics must intrude to save it anywhere; for you cannot save Slavery anywhere without just to that extent saving the Rebellion. Show me anywhere a sympathizer with Slavery and I will show you a sympathizer with the Rebellion.

Our duty is clear. In the sacred service of patriotism nothing can be allowed to stand in the way. Fortress, camp, citadel, each and all must be overcome; but the animating soul of every fortress, camp or citadel throughout the Rebellion is Slavery. Surely, when the country is in danger, there can be no hesitation. And as the greater contains the less, so this greatest charity of country embraces for the time all other charities.

There is another advantage in striking at Slavery, which must not be forgotten. Such a blow is in strict obedience to the laws of nature, and we are reminded by the great master of thought, Lord Bacon, that only through such obedience can victory be won—*vincit parendo*. It is in conformity, also, with all the attributes of God, so that his Almighty Arm will give strength to the blow. Thus do we bring our efforts at once in harmony with the sublime laws, physical and moral, which govern the universe, while every good influence, every breath of Heaven and every prayer of man is on our side. We also bring ourselves in harmony with our own Declaration of Independence, so that all its early promises become a living letter, and our country is at last saved from that practical inconsistency which has been a heavy burden in her history.

Proposed Surrender to Slavery.

To do all this seems so natural and so entirely according to the dictates of patriotism, that we may well be astonished that it should meet opposition. But there is a wide-spread political party, which, true to its history, now comes forward to save belligerent Slavery at this last moment, when it is about to be trampled out forever. Not to save the country but to save belligerent Slavery is the object of the mis-named Democracy. Asserting the war, in which so much has been done, to be a failure; forgetting the vast spaces it has already reclaimed, the rivers it has opened, the ports it has secured and the people it has redeemed; handing over to contempt the officers and men, living and dead, who have waged its innumerable battles,—this political party openly proposes surrender to the Rebellion. I do not use too strong language. It is actual surrender and capitulation that is proposed, in one of two forms,—(1) either by acknowledging the Rebel States, so that they shall be treated as independent, or (2) by acknowledging Slavery, so that it shall be restored to its old supremacy over the National Government, with additional

guarantees. The different schemes of opposition are all contained in one or the other of these two propositions.

Two Propositions of Surrender.

If we examine these two propositions we shall find them equally flagitious and impracticable. Both allow the country to be sacrificed for the sake of Slavery; one, by breaking the Union in pieces that a new Slave Power may be created; and the other by continuing the Union that the old Slave Power may enjoy its sway and masterdom. Both pivot on Slavery. One acknowledges the Slave Power *out of the Union*; the other acknowledges the Slave Power *in the Union*.

Glance, if you please, at these two different forms of surrender.

Surrender by Acknowledging the Rebel States.

I. And, *first, of surrender by acknowledging the Rebel States*, so that they shall be independent. How futile to think that there can be any consent to the establishment of a Slave Power carved out of our Republic. Such a surrender would begin in shame; but it would also begin, continue and end in troubles and sorrows which no imagination can picture.

Abandonment of Unionists and Slaves in Rebel States impossible.

(1.) I do not dwell on the shame that would cover our Republic, but I ask, on the threshold, how you would feel in abandoning to the tender mercies of the Rebellion all those who, from sentiment or conviction or condition, now look to the National Government as a deliverer. This topic has not, it seems to me, been sufficiently impressed upon the country. Would that I could make it sink deep into your souls. There are the Unionists shut up within the confines of the Rebellion, and unable to help themselves. They can do nothing, not even cry out, until the military power of the Rebellion is crushed. Let this be done; let the rebel grip be unloosed, and you will hear their voices, as joyously and reverently they hail the national flag. And there are the slaves, also, to whom the Rebellion is an immense, deep-moated, thick-walled, heavy-bolted Bastile, where a whole race is blinded, manacled and outraged. But these, again, are powerless so long as rebel sentinels keep watch and ward over them. To these two classes in the rebel States we have from the beginning owed a solemn duty, which can be performed only by perseverance to the end. The patriot Unionists, who have kept their loyalty in solitude and privation, like the early Christians concealed in catacombs, and the slaves, also, who have been compelled to serve their cruel task-masters, must not be sacrificed.

Perhaps there is no character in which the National Government may more truly exult than that of Deliverer. Rarely in

history has such a duty, with its attendant glory, been so clearly imposed. The piety of the early ages found vent in the Crusades, those wonderful enterprises of valor and of travel, which exercised such a transforming influence over modern civilization. But our war is not less important. It is a crusade, not to deliver the tomb, but to deliver the living temples of the Lord, and it is destined to exercise a transforming influence beyond any crusade in history.

A Boundary Line impossible.

(2.) But if you agree to abandon the patriots and the slaves in the rebel States, you will only begin your infinite difficulties. How will you determine the boundary line which is to cleave this continent in twain? Where shall the god Terminus be allowed to plant his altar? What States shall be left at the North in the light of Liberty? What States shall be consigned to the gloom of Slavery? Surely no swiftness to surrender can make you surrender Maryland, now redeemed by the votes of citizen soldiers; nor West Virginia, admitted as a Free State into the Union; nor Missouri, which has been made the dark and bloody ground. And how about Kentucky, Tennessee, and Louisiana? There also is the Mississippi, now once more free from its fountains to the sea. Surely this mighty river will not again be compelled to wear chains.

These inquiries simply open the difficulties to be encountered in this endeavor. If there were any natural boundary, constituting in itself a barrier and an altar, or if during long generations any Chinese wall had been built for fifteen hundred miles across the continent, then perhaps there might be a dividing line. But nature and history, by solemn decrees, have fixed it otherwise, and have marked this broad land from the lakes to the Gulf of Mexico, for one Country, with one Liberty, one Constitution, and one Destiny.

Terms or Conditions of Peace impossible.

(3.) But if the boundary line is settled, then will arise the many-headed question of terms and conditions. On what terms and conditions can peace be stipulated? The exulting rebels, whose new empire is founded on the corner-stone of Slavery, will naturally exact promises for the rendition of fugitive slaves. Are you, who have just emancipated yourselves from this obligation, ready to renew it, and to repeat again an inexpressible crime? But, if you do not, how can you expect peace? Then, it will remain to determine the commercial relations between the two separate governments, with rights of transit and travel. If you think that rebels, flushed with success, and scorning their defeated opponents, will come to any practical terms — any terms which

will not leave our commerce and all who are engaged in it exposed to outrage — you place a trust in their moderation which circumstances thus far do not justify. The whole idea is little better than an excursion to the moon, in a car drawn by geese, as described by the Spanish poet.

Long before the war, and especially in the discussions which preceded it, these rebels were fiery and most unscrupulous. War has not made them less so. The moral sense which they wanted when it began has not been enkindled since. With such a people there is no chance of terms and conditions, except according to their lawless will. The first surrender on our part will be the signal to a long line of surrenders, each of which will be a catastrophe. Nothing will be too unreasonable or grinding. If our own national debt is not repudiated, theirs at least must be assumed.

Peace after Recognition impossible.

(4.) But suppose the shameful sacrifice consummated, the impossible boundaries adjusted, and the illusive terms and conditions stipulated, do you imagine that you have obtained peace? Alas! no. Nothing of the sort. You may call it peace; but it will be war in disguise, ready to break forth in perpetual, chronic, bloody battle. Such an extended inland border, over which Slavery and Liberty will scowl at each other, will be a constant temptation not only to enterprises of smuggling, but to hostile incursions, so that our country will be obliged to sleep on its arms, ready to spring forward in self-defence. Every frontier town will be a St. Albans. Military preparations, absorbing the resources of the people, will become permanent instead of temporary, and the arts of peace will yield to the arts of war. The national character will be changed, and this hospitable continent, instead of being the prosperous home of the poor and friendless, thronging from the Old World, will become a repulsive scene of confusion and strife, while “each new day a gash is added to her wounds.”

Have we not war enough now? Are you so enamored of funerals, where the order of nature is reversed, and parents follow their children to the grave, that you are willing to keep a constant carnival for death? Oh! no. You all desire peace. But there is only one way to secure it. You must so conduct the present war that when once ended there shall be no remaining element of discord, no surviving principle of battle, out of which future war can spring. Above all belligerent Slavery must not be allowed to rear its crest, as an independent Power.

Disunion by Recognition is General Anarchy.

(5.) But there is another consequence which must not be omitted. War would not be confined to the two governments representing respectively the two hostile principles, Slavery and Lib-

erty. It would rage with internecine fury among ourselves. Admit that States may fly out of the Union and where will you stop? Other States may follow, it may be in groups, or it may be singly, until our mighty galaxy is broken into separate stars or dissolved into the nebular compost of a people without form or name. Where, then, is country? Where, then, will be those powerful States, which are now the pride of civilization and the hope of mankind? Handed over to ungovernable frenzy, without check or control, until anarchy and chaos are supreme—as with the horses of the murdered Duncan, which, at the assassination of their master,

“Beauteous and swift, the minions of their race,
Turned wild in nature, broke their stalls, flung out,
Contending 'gainst obedience, as they would
Make war with mankind.
'Tis said, they eat each other.”

The picture is terrible; but it hardly exaggerates the fearful disorder. Already our European enemies, looking to their desires for inspiration, predict a general discord. Sometimes it is said that there are to be four or five new nations; that the North-West is to be a nation by itself; the Middle States another; the Pacific States another, and our New England States still another, so that rebel Slavery will be the predominant Power on this continent. But it is useless to speculate on the number of these fractional governments. If disunion is allowed to begin it cannot be stopped. Misrule and confusion will be everywhere. Our fathers saw this at the adoption of the National Constitution, when, in a rude sketch of the time, they pictured the thirteen States as so many staves, which were bound by the hoops into a barrel. Let a single stave be taken out, and the whole barrel falls to pieces. It is easy to see how this must occur with States. The triumph of the Rebellion will be not only the triumph of belligerent Slavery; but it will be also the triumph of State Rights, to this extent, first, that any State, in the exercise of its own lawless will, may abandon its place in the Union, and secondly, that the constitutional verdict of the majority, as in the election of Abraham Lincoln, is not binding. With these two rules of conduct, in conformity with which the Rebellion was organized, there can be no limit to disunion. Therefore, when you consent to the independence of the rebel States, you disband the whole company of States, and blot our country from the map of the world.

Surrender by acknowledging Slavery.

II. I have said enough of surrender by the recognition of the Slave States, or in other words of the Slave Power *out of the Union*. It remains now that I should ask your attention to that other form of surrender which proposes the *recognition of the*

Slave Power in the Union. Each is surrender. The first, as we have already seen, abandons a part of the Union to the Slave Power; the other subjects the whole Union to the Slave Power.

It is proposed that the rebel States should be tempted to lay down their arms by a recognition of Slavery in the Union, with new guarantees and assurances of protection. *Slavery cannot exist in any country which it does not govern.* Therefore, we are to ask the rebel slave-masters to come back and consent to govern us. Such in plain terms is the surrender proposed. For one, I will never consent to any such intolerable rule.

But the whole proposition is not less pernicious than that other form of surrender; nor is it less shameful. It is insulting to reason, and offensive to good morals.

Impossible, because it is a Compromise.

(1.) I say nothing of the ignominy it would bring upon the country; but call attention at once to its character as a Compromise. In the dreary annals of Slavery it is by Compromise that the slave-masters have succeeded in warding off the blows of Liberty. It was a compromise by which that early condemnation of the slave-trade was excluded from the Declaration of Independence; it was a compromise which surrounded the slave-trade with protection in the National Constitution; it was a compromise which secured the admission of Missouri as a slave State; and, without stopping to complete the list, it is enough to say that it was a compromise by which the atrocious Fugitive Slave Bill was fastened upon the country, and the Slave Power was installed in the National Government. And now, after the overthrow of the Slave Power at the ballot-box, followed by years of cruel war, another compromise, greatest of all, is proposed, by which belligerent Slavery, dripping with the blood of our murdered fellow-citizens, shall be welcomed to more than its ancient supremacy. Where is national honor that the criminal pettifoggers are not at once repudiated? Where is national virtue that such a surrender should be proposed.

This proposition is as specious in form as baleful in substance. It is said that the rebel slave-masters should have their "rights under the Constitution." To this plausible language is added the phrase, "the Constitution as it is." All this means Slavery and nothing else. It is for Slavery that men resort to this odious duplicity. Thank God! the game is understood.

Impossible, because Slavery has fallen, legally and constitutionally.

(2.) But any compromise which shall recognize Slavery in the rebel States is impossible, even if you were disposed to accept it. Slavery by the very act of rebellion, ceased to exist, legally or constitutionally. It ceased to exist according to principles of

public law, and also according to a just interpretation of the Constitution; and having once ceased to exist it cannot be revived.

When I say that it ceased to exist *legally*, I found myself on an unquestionable principle of public law, that Slavery is a peculiar local institution, without any origin in natural right, and deriving its support exclusively from the local government; but if this be true—and it cannot be denied—then Slavery must have fallen with that local government.

When I say that it ceased to exist *constitutionally*, I found myself on the principle that Slavery is of such a character that it cannot exist within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Constitution, as for instance in the National territories, and that therefore, it died constitutionally when, through the disappearance of the local government, it fell within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Constitution.

The consequences of these two principles are most important. Taken in conjunction with the rule, that “once free always free,” they illustrate the impossibility of any surrender to belligerent Slavery *in the Union*.

Impossible, on account of Proclamation of Emancipation.

(3.) If, in the zeal of surrender, you reject solemn principles of public law and Constitution, then let me remind you of the Proclamation of Emancipation, where the President, by virtue of the power vested in him as Commander-in-Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, ordered that the slaves in the rebel States, “are and henceforward shall be free,” and the Executive Government, including the military and naval authorities, are pledged to “recognize and maintain the freedom of such persons.” By the terms of this instrument, it is applicable to all the slaves in the rebel States; not merely to those within the military lines of the United States; but to all. Even if the President were not bound in simple honesty to maintain this Proclamation to the letter, he has not the power to undo it. He may make a freeman, but he cannot make a slave. Therefore he must reject all surrender, inconsistent with this Act of Emancipation.

It is sometimes said that the Court will set aside the Proclamation. Do not believe it. The Court will do no such thing. It will recognize this act precisely as it recognizes other political and military acts, without presuming to interpose any unconstitutional *veto*, and it will recognize it to the full extent, as it was intended, according to its letter, so that every slave in the rebel States will be free. But even if courts should hesitate, there can be no hesitation with the President or with the country, bound in sacred honor to the freedom of every slave in the rebel States. Therefore, against every effort of surrender, the Proclamation presents an insuperable barrier.

Impossible, because it would not bring Peace.

(4.) But if you are willing to descend to the unutterable degradation of renouncing the Proclamation, then in the name of peace, do I protest against any such surrender. So long as Slavery exists in the Union, there can be no peace. The fires which seem to be extinguished will only be covered by treacherous ashes, out of which another conflagration may spring to wrap the country in war. This must not be.

It is because Slavery is not understood, that people are willing to tolerate it. See it as it is, and there can be no question. Slavery has in it all common crimes. The slave-master is burglar, for by night he enters forcibly into the house of another; he is highway robber, for he stops another on the road, and compels him to surrender his purse; he is pickpocket, for he picks the pocket of his slave; he is sneak, for there is no pettiness of petty larceny which he does not employ; he is horse-stealer, for he takes from his slave the horse that is his; he is adulterer, for he takes from the slave the wife that is his; he is the receiver of stolen goods on the grandest scale, for the human being that has been stolen from Africa, he foolishly calls his own. When I describe a slave-master, it is simply as he describes himself in the law which he sanctions. All crime is in Slavery, and so every criminal is reproduced in the slave-master. And yet it is proposed to give to this whole class not only new license for their crimes, but a new lease of their power. Such a surrender would be only the beginning of long-continued, unutterable troubles, breaking forth in bloodshed and sorrow without end.

Impossible, because Slavery is the Rebellion.

(5.) But, lastly, this surrender cannot be made without surrender to the Rebellion. Already I have exhibited the identity between Slavery and the Rebellion; and yet it is proposed to recognize Slavery in the Union. Such a recognition will be the recognition of the Rebellion.

The whole thing is impossible, and not to be tolerated. Too much blood has been shed, and too much treasure has been lavished, to allow this war to close with any such national stultification. The Rebellion must be crushed, whether in the guise of war or under the *alias* of Slavery. It must be trampled out so that it can never show itself again, or prolong itself into another generation. Not to do this completely, is not to do it all. Others may do as they please, but I wash my hands of this great responsibility. History will not hold such surrender blameless. "An orphan's curse would drag to hell a spirit from on high;" but the orphans of this war must heap their curses heaven-high upon the man who would consent to see its blood and treasure end in nought.

No Surrender to Slavery.

Such are the grounds for the repudiation of all surrender to Slavery *in the Union*. I have already shown that there can be no surrender to Slavery *out of the Union*. In either alternative surrender is impossible; but even if it were possible, it would be most perilous and degrading.

Platforms and Candidates.

Thus far I have said nothing of platforms or candidates. I have desired to present the issue of principle, so that the patriot could choose without any embarrassment from party associations. Pardon me now if for one moment I bring platforms and candidates to the touchstone.

There is the Baltimore platform, with Abraham Lincoln as candidate. No surrender here. In one resolution it is declared that the war must be prosecuted "with the utmost possible vigor to the *complete suppression of the Rebellion*." In another it is declared "that as Slavery was the cause, and now constitutes the strength of this rebellion, and as it must be always and everywhere hostile to the principles of republican government, *justice and the national safety demand its utter and complete extirpation from the soil of the Republic*." There is salvation in these words, which pronounce the doom of Slavery in the name of justice and the national safety. The candidate has solemnly accepted them, not only when he accepted his nomination, but yet again, when, in the discharge of his official duties, he said briefly "To all whom it may concern," that there could be no terms of peace except on the condition of "the integrity of the Union and the abandonment of Slavery." In that letter of the President, unquestionably the best he ever wrote, it is practically declared, in conformity with the Baltimore platform, that there can be no surrender to Slavery in the Union or out of the Union.

Turn to the Chicago platform and its candidate, and what a contrast! There is surrender in both forms. The platform surrenders to Slavery *out of the Union*, and, in proposing a "cessation of hostilities," prepares the way for the recognition of the rebel States. The candidate, in a letter accepting the nomination, surrenders to Slavery *in the Union*. The platform plainly looks to disunion. The letter seems to look to Union; but whether it looks to Union or not, it plainly surrenders to Slavery.

But there is still another surrender in the Chicago platform. While professing a formal devotion to the Union it declines to insist upon "National unity," or "a Union on the basis of the Constitution of the United States." No such terms are employed; but we are invited to seek peace "on the basis of the Federal Union of the States," so that according to this platform it is not the National Union—that Union of the people—accepted by

Washington and defended by Webster, which we are to have, but a "Federal Union of States," where State Sovereignty as accepted by John C. Calhoun and defended by Jefferson Davis, will be supreme; and all this simply for the sake of Slavery.

Look at the Chicago platform or candidate, as you will, and you are constantly brought back to Slavery as the animating impulse. Look at the Baltimore platform or candidate, and you are constantly brought back to Liberty as the animating impulse. And thus again Slavery and Liberty stand face to face—the slave-ship against the May-flower.

There is a contrast between the two platforms which ought not to be forgotten. That of Chicago, while saying nothing against the Rebellion, uses ambiguous language which is interpreted differently by different persons, while that of Baltimore is so plain and unequivocal that it leaves no room for question. But this contrast is greater still, when we look at the two candidates. Perhaps it never was presented between two candidates to the same extent. The Chicago candidate has written a subtle letter, which is interpreted according to the desires of its readers. Some find peace in it, and others find war. And this double-faced proceeding is his bid for the Presidency. I need not remind you that our candidate has never uttered a word of duplicity, and that his speeches and letters can be interpreted only in one way. And such are the two representatives of Slavery and Liberty.

The True Issue.

Fellow-citizens, such is the issue of principle; such are the platforms and candidates. And, now, I ask fearlessly, are you for Slavery, or are you for Liberty? Or, changing the form of the question, are you for the Rebellion, or are you for your country? For this is the question which you must answer by your votes. In your answer, do not forget, I intreat you, its infinite, far-reaching, many-sided importance. This is no ordinary election. It is a battle-field of the war; and victory at the polls will assure victory everywhere. Grant, Sherman, Sheridan, Farragut, all are watching for it. Their trumpets are ready to echo back our election bells.

Grandeur of the Cause.

In every aspect the contest is vast. It is vast in its relations to our own country; it is vaster still in its relations to other countries. Overthrow Slavery here and you overthrow it everywhere—in Cuba, Brazil, and wherever a slave clanks his chain. The whole execrable pretension of "property in man," wherever it now shows its hideous front, will be driven back into its kindred night. Nor is this all. Overthrow Slavery here and our Republic ascends to untold heights of power and grandeur. Thus far its natural influence has been impaired by Slavery. Let this shame-

ful burthen be dropped, and our example will be the day-star of the world. Liberty, everywhere, in all her struggles, will be animated anew, and the down-trodden in distant lands will hail the day of deliverance. But let Slavery prevail, and our Republic will drop from its transcendent career, while the cause of liberal institutions in all lands will be darkened. There have been great battles in the past, on which Human Progress has been staked. There was Marathon, when the Persian hosts were driven back from Greece; there was Tours, when the Saracens were arrested in their victorious career by Charles Martel; there was Lepanto, when the Turks were brought to a stand in their conquests; there was Waterloo. But our contest is grander. We are fighting for national life, assailed by belligerent Slavery; but such is the solidarity of nations, and so are mankind knit together, that our battle is now for the liberty of the world. The voice of victory here will resound through the universe.

Never was grander cause or sublimer conflict. Never holier sacrifice. Who is not saddened at the thought of the precious lives that have been given to Liberty's defence? The soil of the Rebellion is soaked with patriot blood; its turf is bursting with patriot dead. Surely they have not died in vain. The flag which they upheld will continue to advance. But this depends upon your votes. Therefore, for the sake of that flag, and for the sake of the brave men that bore it, now sleeping where no trumpet of battle can wake them, stand by the flag.

Tell me not of "failure" in this war. There can be but one failure, and that is the failure to make an end of Slavery; for on this righteous consummation everything depends. Let Liberty be with us, and no power can prevail against us. Let Slavery be acknowledged, and there is no power which will not mock and insult us. Such is the teaching of history, in one of its greatest examples. Napoleon, when compelled to exchange his empire for a narrow island prison, exclaimed in bitterness of spirit, "it is not the coalition which has dethroned me; it is liberal ideas." It was not the European coalition, marshalling its forces from the Don to the Orkneys, that toppled the man of destiny from his lofty throne; but it was that Liberty which he had offended. He saw and confessed the terrible antagonist, when he cried out, "I cannot re-establish myself; I have shocked the people; I have sinned against *liberal ideas*, and I perish." Memorable words of instruction and warning. It is ideas that rule the world, and, unlike batteries and battalions, they cannot be destroyed or cut to pieces. Let us so conduct this contest that we shall not shock mankind or sin against Liberty. Let us so conduct it that we shall have Providence on our side. Nature has placed the eye in the front, that we may look *forward and upward*; and it is only

by a contortion that we are able to look behind. Therefore, in looking forward and upward, we follow nature. There was an ancient adventurer who looked behind as he was escaping from the realms of death, and he failed. We, too, shall fail if we look behind. Forward, not backward, is the word; firmly, courageously, faithfully. There must be no false sentiment or cowardice. There must be no fear of "irritating" the rebels. When the Almighty Power hurled Satan and his impious peers

"—— headlong flaming from the ethereal sky,
With hideous ruin and combustion, down
To bottomless perdition, there to dwell
In adamant chains and penal fire,"

there was no Chicago platform, proposing "a cessation of hostilities, with a view to a convention or other peaceable means;" nor was there any attempt to save the traitors from divine vengeance. Personal injuries we may forgive; but government cannot always forgive. There are cases where pardon is out of place. Society that has been outraged must be protected. That beautiful land, now degraded by Slavery, must be redeemed, and a generous statesmanship must fix forever its immutable condition. If the chiefs of the Rebellion are compelled to give way to emigrants from the North and from Europe, swelling population, creating new values, and opening new commerce; if the "poor whites" are reinstated in their rights; if a whole race is lifted to manhood and womanhood; if roads are extended; if schools are planted,—there will be nothing done inconsistent with that just clemency which I rejoice to consider a public duty. Liberty is the best cultivator, the surest teacher and the most enterprising merchant. The whole country will confess the new-born power, and those commercial cities which now sympathize so perversely with belligerent Slavery, will be among the earliest to enjoy the quickening change. Beyond all question the overthrow of this portentous crime, besides its immeasurable contributions to civilization everywhere, will accomplish two things of direct material advantage; first, it will raise the fee-simple of the whole South, and secondly, it will enlarge the commerce of the whole North.

I turn from these things in humble gratitude to God, as I behold my country at last redeemed and fixed in history, the Columbus of Nations, once in chains, but now hailed as benefactor and discoverer, who gave a New Liberty to mankind. Foreign powers already watch the scene with awe. Saints and patriots from their home in the skies look down with delight; and Washington, who set free his own slaves, exults that the Republic which revered him as Father has followed his example.

71. 2009. 084. 09807

